	Case 3:07-cv-03953-PJH Document 52	2 Filed 09/08/2008 Page 1 of 3					
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MARTIN D. BERN (State Bar No. 153203) Martin.Bern@mto.com MALCOLM A. HEINICKE (State Bar No. 1 Malcolm.Heinicke@mto.com MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP 560 Mission Street, Twenty-Seventh Floor San Francisco, CA 94105-2907 Telephone: (415) 512-4000 Facsimile: (415) 512-4077 Attorneys for Defendant GUARDSMARK, LLC	94174) ES DISTRICT COURT					
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA						
10	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION						
11 12	JOHNNY MCFARLAND, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,	CASE NO. CV 07-03953 PJH					
13	Plaintiff, vs.	AMENDED STIPULATION AND [P ROPOSED] ORDER RE: GUARDSMARK'S MOTION FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES					
14 15	GUARDSMARK, LLC, and Does 1 through 50, inclusive,						
16	Defendant.						
17							
18							
19 20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							

1	WHEREAS, the Court entered judgment in this matter on August 26, 2008, and			
2	thus absent an Order of the Court, Guardsmark would need to file a motion seeking some or all o			
3	its incurred attorney's fees no later than September 9, 2008;			
4	WHEREAS, Defendant Guardsmark, LLC has notified Plaintiff Johnny			
5	McFarland of Guardsmark's intent to file a motion seeking some or all of its incurred attorney's			
6	fees;			
7	WHEREAS, district courts retain jurisdiction to hear post-judgment attorney's fee			
8	motions despite a pending appeal of the underlying case. See, e.g., Masalosalo v. Stonewall Ins.			
9	Co., 718 F.2d 955, 957 (9th Cir. 1983);			
10	WHEREAS, counsel for the parties are engaging in the meet and confer process,			
11	and counsel for Plaintiff need additional time for internal discussions on the issues raised by			
12	Guardsmark, and Guardsmark does not object to such an extension;			
13	WHEREAS, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54 and Civil Local Rule 54-6 allow			
14	the Court, upon stipulation, to extend the 14-day deadline for a party to seek attorney's fees			
15	following judgment;			
16	WHEREAS, it is understood that Plaintiff has not at this point in any way			
17	conceded that Guardsmark is entitled to attorney's fees in this case;			
18	WHEREAS, an earlier submission of this stipulation had the incorrect extension			
19	date through a typographical error by defense counsel;			
20	WHEREAS, the parties through their counsel of record stipulate to the entry of an			
21	order as follows:			
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

IT IS	HEREBY	STIPUL	ATED	THAT:

The deadline for Guardsmark to file its motion for attorney fees based on the judgment entered in this case is hereby extended by one week to September 16, 2008.

DATED: September 5, 2008 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP

5

1

2

3

4

By: /s/ Malcolm A. Heinicke

MALCOLM A. HEINICKE

7

8 Attorneys for Defendant GUARDSMARK, LLC

9

DATED: September 5, 2008 QUALLS & WORKMAN, L.L.P.

11

10

By: /s/ Daniel Qualls
DANIEL QUALLS

1314

Attorneys for Plaintiff JOHNNY MCFARLAND

15

16

I, Malcolm A. Heinicke, attest that I have obtained concurrence from Daniel Qualls in the filing of this Stipulation And [Proposed] Order Re: Guardsmark's Motion For Attorney Fees. *See* N.D. Cal. General Order 45 § 10(B).

17

18

19

20

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED. The deadline for Guardsmark to file its motion for attorney fees based on the judgment entered in this case is hereby extended by one week to September 16, 2008.

21

22

DATED: 9/8/08

23

24

25

26

27

28

FOE Honorable Phyllis J. Hamilton
Diffed States D:

IT IS SO ORDERED

Judge Phyllis J. Hamilton

Judge Phyllis J. Hamilton

Judge Phyllis J. Hamilton

Judge Phyllis J. Hamilton

- 3 - ORDER RE BRIEFING ON FEE MOTION; CASE NO. CV 07-03953 PJ